1	CRAIG H. MISSAKIAN United States Attorney	
2	450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055	
3	San Francisco, California 94102-3495 Telephone: (415) 436-7200 Fax: (415) 436-6748	
4	, ,	
5	ERIC J. HAMILTON (CABN 296283) Deputy Assistant Attorney General DIANE KELLEHER	
6	Branch Director	
7	CHRISTOPHER HALL Assistant Branch Director	
8	ANDREW M. BERNIE CESAR E. AZRAK	
9	Trial Attorneys Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch	
0		
1	1100 L Street, NW Washington, DC 20005	
2	Telephone: (202) 353-7203 andrew.m.bernie@usdoj.gov	
3	Counsel for Defendants	
4	HNUTED OT ATEC D	ISTRICT COURT
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
6		Case No. 3:25-cv-03698-SI
7	AMERICAN FEDERATION OF	Case 110. 5.25-cv-03098-51
8	GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, et al.	DEFENDANTS' REPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' REQUEST FOR STATUS
9	Plaintiffs,	CONFERENCE AND/OR
20	v.	CLARIFICATION OF ORDERS RE: DISCOVERY
21 22	DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity as President of the United States, <i>et al.</i> ,	
23	Defendants.	
24		
25		
an i		
26 27		
26 27 28		

Defendants' Response to Plaintiffs' Request for Status Conference and/or Clarification of Orders re: Discovery (ECF 245) 3:25-cv-3698-SI

Defendants' Response to Plaintiffs' Request for Status Conference and/or Clarification of Orders re: Discovery (ECF 245)

9

11

19

Defendants respectfully respond to Plaintiffs' Request for Status Conference and/or Clarification of Orders re: Discovery (ECF 245). In response, Defendants state:

- 1. Plaintiffs filed their Request approximately one hour after asking for Defendants' position. Defendants had not responded to Plaintiffs' inquiry as they were making internal inquiries in order to respond when they saw the notification for ECF 245.
- 2. Had Plaintiffs waited for a response, Defendants would have told them that they expected to be able to complete their production soon, and in any event, within 30 days, the time by which Defendants had promised to provide a privilege log.
- 3. Plaintiffs' decision to once again seek this Court's involvement in ongoing discovery disputes is neither appropriate nor efficient. Plaintiffs and Defendants should try to resolve matters without asking the Court to hold status conferences.
- 4. If the parties still have a dispute after an actual meet-and-confer, then Plaintiffs can file a motion, and Defendants can respond, and the Court can decide, for itself, if it wishes to hold a status conference.
- 5. Defendants oppose Plaintiffs' request for clarification and a conference in the absence of: (1) a meet-and-confer between the parties (which should occur on the phone and involve real-time interactions between counsel) and (2) a written motion.¹

For these reasons, Defendants ask that the Court **DENY** Plaintiffs' request for clarification or a conference.

¹ Defendants will shortly be filing a revised version of their Notice (ECF 244), to address a question raised by Plaintiffs.

Defendants' Response to Plaintiffs' Request for Status Conference and/or Clarification of Orders re: Discovery (ECF 245) 3:25-cv-3698-SI

1

2

Dated: August 12, 2025

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Respectfully submitted,

CRAIG H. MISSAKIAN Acting United States Attorney U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Francisco, California 94102-3495

ERIC J. HAMILTON (CABN 296283) Deputy Assistant Attorney General

DIANE KELLEHER Branch Director

CHRISTOPHER HALL Assistant Branch Director

s/ Cesar Azrak
Cesar Azrak
Andrew Bernie
Trial Attorneys
United States Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
1100 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 305-0693
cesar.e.azrak@usdoj.gov

Counsel for Defendants

Defendants' Responseto Plaintiffs' Request for Status Conference and/or Clarification of Orders re: Discovery (ECF 245)